

USE

April 7, 1965

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I am calling today for an investigation of the Department of State because I have learned of the shocking fact that the United States has no more than six State Department people in Vietnam who can speak the local dialect.

I have visited Vietnam twice during the past year. On each occasion I returned with increased alarm at our deteriorating position there.

Last week, a group of Congressmen including myself were briefed by officials from the Department of State. In light of the hundreds of millions of dollars we are pouring into Vietnam each day, I asked these people to what extent we have direct language communication with the average Vietnamese outside of Saigon.

The answer is a national disgrace.

After 10 years of involvement, we still have only 6 State Department people there who can speak the local dialect, and only 25 currently receiving language training.

The Vietcong and the Communists are masters of persuasion and subtle indoctrination as well as vicious fighters. They have propaganda teams accompanying every combat unit, people fluent and facile in subverting the spirit and purpose of the free Vietnamese.

Mr. Speaker, how can we hope to bring peace to this area if we cannot even communicate directly with the people in the provinces whose understanding of our purposes and commitment is vital, if freedom is to prevail.

We have committed our prestige, our wealth, and American lives. Yet, we have neglected a fundamental—we have failed to train our people to get our message across—the message of hope that must be understood if freedom is to prevail in the long run.

Mr. Speaker, I am calling for a study of this inexplicable situation. I want to know the reason why the Department of State has overlooked so primary a factor in the tragic war that has engrossed the attention and concern of all Americans.

That Americans in Vietnam cannot even speak the language of the people we are helping is appalling. It is time the American people knew of this amazing situation.

#### CONSOLIDATED FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION ACT OF 1961

(Mr. KEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which will amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to provide:

First, An authorization for the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration to participate in grants and loans for waste disposal systems under the same provisions which have made it possible, through the Farmers Home Administration, for rural areas to have an adequate water system and, second, to specifically designate rural areas with a population of not more than 5,000 residents as communities, rather than the present administrative determination of 2,500.

#### HALF-TRAINED AMERICAN PERSON- NEL IN VIETNAM

(Mr. WOLFF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

April 7, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

6991

In this connection, it is my privilege to include for the attention of the House the outstanding accomplishments of the Farmers Home Administration in the Fifth Congressional District of West Virginia:

#### SUMMARY—MONROE SWIMMING POOL ASSOCIATION

A \$35,500 soil and water association loan is being made by the Farmers Home Administration to develop a recreational area at Union, W. Va. The loan will be closed on April 9, 1965.

Construction of the project will provide 250 man-days of labor for plumbers, electricians, masons, and other construction workers and remove 4 acres from agricultural production. Approximately three new jobs will be provided in the operation and maintenance of the area.

The loan was obtained from the Farmers Home Administration by the Monroe Swimming Pool Association, a nonprofit organization of 115 rural families living in and near Union. Members will pay annual dues and fees to support the facility. In addition, income will be received from fees charged of guests and a concession stand.

Approximately 600 people will use the facilities each year, association officials estimate.

Loan funds will finance the purchase of land previously in agricultural production and pay the costs of constructing a swimming pool, bathhouse and other related facilities.

The association will serve the communities of Union, Sinks Grove, Pickaway, Gap Mills, Greenville, and surrounding farm areas. Approximately 3,000 people live in the area to be served.

The project is supported by the Rotarians, Ruritan, Home Demonstration Clubs, Masons, and other civic clubs in this area.

Recreation projects of this type boost rural areas development. Such endeavors bring new jobs to rural communities and provide much needed recreational facilities for urban and rural families. In addition, these facilities help develop the type of rural community that encourages young people to remain in their hometown, attracts industry, and promotes tourism. These projects also utilize land not needed for crop production.

The loan will be repaid over a 25-year period. Members of the association are contributing \$9,500 to the cost of the project development.

Officers of the association are: H. L. Sarver, Jr., president; G. C. Mitchell, Jr., vice president; and G. C. Shanklin, Jr., secretary-treasurer, all of Union, W. Va.

#### SUMMARY OF LOAN ACTIVITIES OF FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION—FIFTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA

USDA Farmers Home Administration, during fiscal 1964, made 111 loans totaling \$955,763 in West Virginia's Fifth Congressional District.

These loans strengthened family farms and rural communities. Assuming that each dollar loaned passed through at least five hands as it was spent and repaid these loans had a cumulative economic impact of \$4,770,000. In addition, the funds increased the earning capacity of family farmers, broadened the tax base, made rural communities even more attractive.

The Farmers Home Administration program has been greatly expanded and improved during the past 4 years. The Agriculture and Housing Acts of 1961 and 1962, plus new leadership, revitalized every phase of its operations.

Most of the loans made by the Farmers

Home Administration are from funds advanced by private lenders on an insured basis and from collections of loans made in previous years.

#### FARM DEVELOPMENT, IMPROVEMENT

Some of the Farmers Home Administration funds were used to strengthen the position of the family farmer through operating and farm ownership loans. A total of 57 farmers borrowed \$152,690 from the Farmers Home Administration in fiscal 1964 in operating loans to pay for equipment, feed, seed, livestock, for other farm and home operating needs, and to refinance chattel debts.

Farmers received \$96,883 through 10 farm ownership loans to enlarge, develop and buy family farms, and to refinance debts.

Fifteen farmers and rural residents received loans from the Farmers Home Administration totaling \$161,800 to build or improve their homes or essential farm buildings. In addition, a loan for the construction of an individual housing unit for a senior citizen totaled \$5,100.

Grants to 40 low-income rural residents for minor repairs and improvements to existing housing totaled \$35,800.

A total of \$202,700 was advanced for rural housing in 1964.

#### EMERGENCY LOANS

Emergency loans amounting to \$26,290 were made to 26 farmers to assist them in maintaining normal farming operations following natural disasters.

#### MULTIPURPOSE DAM, WATER SYSTEM FINANCED BY FHA CREDIT

A group of more than 2,400 rural people in West Virginia's Fifth Congressional District will soon be served by the water system being constructed in Mercer County's Green Valley and Glenwood communities with two Farmers Home Administration loans and a community facilities administration grant made during fiscal 1964. The borrowing group was the Green Valley-Glenwood public service district.

A \$388,000 FHA loan and a \$338,000 CFA grant are being used to construct and install the water system while a \$125,000 watershed loan is being used to construct a multipurpose dam for providing a source of water. These loans were closed during April 1964.

The system—now well under construction—includes a filtration and treatment plant, a booster station, storage for 275,000 gallons of water and 20 miles of pipeline.

#### ANOTHER FHA FINANCED SYSTEM BEING BUILT IN MERCER COUNTY

Over 4,300 farm and rural residents in the Brush Fork, Bluewell and Montcalm communities of Mercer County in West Virginia's Fifth Congressional District will soon be enjoying an ample supply of safe water for the first time as the result of a \$768,460 insured loan made in fiscal 1965.

Farmers Home Administration supervised credit extended the Bluewell public service district and a \$481,500 community facilities administration grant are being used to finance construction of a 400-gallon-per-minute capacity purification plant, the installation of a 75-gallon-per-minute booster station, a 2,000-gallon storage and the laying of some 22 miles of pipe. Also to be constructed are two storage reservoirs having a total capacity of close to 52 million gallons of water.

#### APPROVAL GIVEN TO COMMUNITY RECREATIONAL LOAN

Monroe Swimming Pool Association, Union in Monroe County, has received approval for \$35,500 in Farmers Home Administration supervised credit to finance a complete outdoor recreational facility including a swimming pool. When constructed, this recrea-

tional center will include a picnic area and tennis court and will serve over 550 farm and rural residents.

#### ALL FIFTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT COUNTIES SERVED BY FHA OFFICES

Farmers Home Administration offices serve all rural counties in West Virginia's Fifth District. Loans are made only to applicants who are unable to obtain credit from conventional lenders and are accompanied by technical assistance in farm and financial management.

#### FARM LABOR IN CALIFORNIA

(Mr. LEGGETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute; to revise and extend his remarks and to include a letter from the Yolo Growers Association.)

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I take this time to comment on a colloquy which occurred yesterday on the issue of farm labor in California.

Mr. Speaker, I am not at all ashamed of our program out there.

As Members of the House will recall, last year I said that we paid these impoverished foreign workers that come to our State at the rate of \$1.35 an hour, which I understand is about 35 cents an hour higher than the national average paid to such workers.

Mr. Speaker, we use 60 percent of this bracero force in the harvesting of tomatoes in California and one-third of that production is in the congressional district which it is my privilege to represent.

Mr. Speaker, I polled my district last week to ascertain the current attitude of my constituents and I found out of 14,866 acres that were planted for the 1963-64 crop that they plan to plant this year 10,230 acres, provided adequate assurances are forthcoming by the Secretary of Labor that a supplemental labor force of some size will be provided for our State.

Mr. Speaker, for those Members of the House who think that these producers are all large corporate growers—and I remind them that this survey covers a total of 14,866 acres or approximately 50 percent of the tomato acreage planted last year—I insert the following tabulation, together with the covering letter:

YOLO GROWERS, INC.,

Woodland, Calif., March 26, 1965.

Congressman ROBERT L. LEGGETT,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: We are enclosing, for your information, a survey just concluded by members of our staff pointing out the contemplated tomato acreage to be planted this year by members of this association.

The results of the survey show a 31-percent reduction under last year's acreage and covers growers who last year planted approximately 50 percent of the county's total acreage.

We will continue to keep you advised as changes occur, which we feel certain will happen, as the situation becomes more settled.

Sincerely yours,

RUBEN J. LOPEZ,  
Secretary-Manager.

6992

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

April 7, 1965

Yolo Growers, Inc., Woodland, Calif.,  
Mar. 26, 1965—Tomato acreage

Name	1964	1965	Ma- chines
D. Argumedo.....	110	110	-----
G. L. Ayilla.....	200	200	-----
M. B. Ayilla.....	280	230	-----
N. Aoki.....	128	130	1
T. Barrios.....	340	300	-----
Buchignani & Hughes.....	40	80	-----
T. L. Burke.....	160	180	-----
R. L. Button.....	250	170	-----
		*125	1
Chew Bros.....	450	600	-----
T. Combs.....	150	0	-----
J. Contreras.....	150	135	-----
Danielson & Danielson.....	220	140	-----
Damsen Bros.....	85	110	-----
Dela Torres Bros.....	500	35	-----
V. Eriksen.....	150	140	-----
L. Eveland.....	550	300	-----
M. B. Flores.....	400	100	-----
		*100	-----
Frates & Shimada.....	150	140	-----
Donald Fong.....	300	300	-----
M. Sandoval.....	435	430	-----
Harlan & Dumas.....	300	180	-----
		*140	2
Hatanaka Bros.....	250	240	2
Heidrick Farms, Inc.....	750	350	-----
N. Hitomi.....	190	200	2
P. Hoppin.....	350	270	-----
R. Howald.....	400	130	-----
J. Jackson.....	100	0	-----
Ed Jang.....	230	150	-----
C. Kimura.....	360	200	1
Lenel Farms.....	80	0	-----
L. Knight Co.....	120	0	-----
C. Low.....	175	140	-----
Meek & Lemaitre.....	500	230	1
Martinelli Bros.....	40	120	-----
K. Matsumoto.....	350	300	2
H. S. Matsumura & Son.....	250	250	1
June Morita.....	250	150	-----
F. Y. Morita.....	220	175	-----
S. Nakagaki.....	120	100	-----
Nishi Bros.....	350	150	-----
Orth Bros.....	80	0	-----
Ojima Farms.....	400	340	-----
Mas Ojima.....	220	180	-----
Parella Farms.....	200	0	-----
J. Pena.....	100	100	-----
M. Pereyra.....	140	100	-----
E. W. Pollock.....	265	185	-----
Harvey Rominger.....	65	0	-----
Both Bros.....	105	0	-----
E. Rumsey.....	70	140	-----
Shimada Bros.....	200	160	-----
Sagara Bros.....	230	0	-----
T. Sakata (Sakata Bros.).....	0	155	-----
P. Stephens & Son.....	100	130	1
H. Takimoto.....	122	120	-----
Ed Ullrich.....	200	150	1
Jim Ward.....	100	160	1
F. Warner.....	150	140	-----
M. Wakida.....	150	130	-----
G. B. Weiss, Jr.....	40	0	-----
Wetzel Bros.....	450	140	-----
		*200	-----
Don Wilson.....	116	0	-----
E. N. Winters.....	80	100	1
Joe Yeung.....	200	200	-----
Carl Hahn.....	560	470	-----
St. Regis Paper Co.....	100	0	-----
Total.....	14,866	10,230	17

<sup>1</sup> These growers upon being contacted indicated they would not plant any acreage unless assured of labor within the next 2 weeks. A few growers have committed themselves to some acreage but will follow the same policy as above on the acreage indicated. The actual commitment is indicated by an asterisk (\*).

The remainder of the growers listed will plant or have planted the number of acres indicated under 1965. 66 members farming in Yolo County were contacted out of total of 75 or 88 percent.

According to the Crop Reporting Service approximately 30,000 acres were planted in Yolo County in 1964.

This survey covers a total of 14,866 acres or approximately 50 percent of the tomato acreage planted last year. The acreage this year of the growers who planted the above-mentioned 14,866 acres is down to 10,230 acres or a drop of 31 percent.

## AN HONEST, EXTRA EFFORT

(Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include a letter sent to the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture.)

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to and read with great interest the many comments that have been

made in this body and in the press concerning the problem of making available agricultural labor for our farmers. It distresses me that there are those who take a very authoritative view of the matter when their knowledge is confined to just one segment of the entire problem.

The shortage of agricultural labor, both present and anticipated, is not confined to the large, corporate farms. On the contrary, it is the family farm, the farm with the small to modest income, the farm that cannot afford the high cost of mechanization that will suffer if manual labor is not available.

When I speak of the farm laborer, Mr. Speaker, I wish to make it clear that all producers that I know of would prefer to hire qualified domestic farm labor if it is available. I use the word "qualified" for a very good reason. Today's farm laborer must have more to offer, other than the fact that he happens to be unemployed. Physical stamina, manual dexterity, attitude toward work, and proper motivation are all essential qualities that every producer has the right to expect in his workers if he is to maintain an efficient and competitive operation in an industry where the margin of profit is no more certain than the weather.

As one who has dealt directly with this matter of agricultural labor, I find myself wondering why we had greater human efficiency among the domestic farm laborers of 20 and 30 years ago who worked without many of our modern conveniences. I would never deny to our workers whatever adds our technology can produce, but must it be at the expense of steady and efficient application by the laborer?

There has been a great deal of emphasis placed on the question of wages. In the case of the sugarbeet producers in Colorado and elsewhere the wages paid are those determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, but the question is raised: just where does the burden of increased wages fall? Consumer resistance to high food prices makes it obvious that the cost will have to be borne, in a great measure, by the producer—a man who is faced with some very definite economic limits.

I join with all those who deplore the reported substandard working conditions that are offered in some areas, but, because there are laws which deal with these problems directly, I regard it as an issue separate from this question of the availability of labor.

I have directed a letter to the Secretary of Labor in which I have advised him of the agricultural labor situation as it will affect the sugarbeet and other farm production in the State of Colorado. I submit it as evidence that an honest, extra effort is being made by agricultural interests, to obtain farm labor for the State of Colorado.

The letter follows:

APRIL 5, 1965.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I wish to take this opportunity to advise you of my grave concern over the very real possibility that the sugarbeet and other agricultural producers in the State of Colorado will experience a critical labor shortage this year and a resultant economic loss of serious proportions.

I know that you have been contacted by many others in this regard and I, myself, have been in touch with some of your very cooperative assistants, but I feel the urgent need to bring this matter to your personal attention.

If I appear to place a special emphasis on the plight of the sugarbeet producer, it is only because they will meet this problem sooner than the other row-crop farmers in the State.

In just one portion of the Fourth Congressional District which I represent, there were 153,780 acres planted to sugarbeets and under contract to the Great Western Sugar Co. I call your attention to the following figures which relate to the labor that was required to work that acreage in 1964:

Types of workers	Acreage worked	Number of workers	Average acres per worker
Growers' families.....	1,068	-----	-----
Resident labor.....	17,446	1,703	10.24
Youth groups.....	16	5	3.20
Indians.....	-----	-----	-----
Out-of-State domestics.....	46,908	4,116	11.40
Mexican nationals.....	88,342	4,665	18.94

You will note, Mr. Secretary, that Mexican nationals made up a little less than half of the total workers employed, and yet they worked nearly half again as many acres as all the domestic workers combined. This, of course, is not startling news, for the higher production records of the Mexican nationals is an established fact. What it does mean, however, is that, if we are to continue working the 88,342 acres handled by foreign labor last year, we must recruit almost 9,000 domestic workers to do the same work turned in by the 4,665 Mexican nationals.

Mr. Secretary, every other industry is permitted to operate with a set of standards that they establish for their employees. Why is it that agriculture is now being told to go out and hire from among the unemployed, even among those found unacceptable to other more favored industries? It is no more realistic to expect everyone who is unemployed to become a valuable agricultural worker than it is to expect that every unemployed person could step up and operate a drill press or serve as a bank teller. Agricultural workers are often called unskilled laborers, but such qualifications as physical stamina, manual dexterity, attitude, and motivation must be possessed by the farm laborer, and they are certainly not possessed by all the unemployed.

I know of your sincere interest in this matter, Mr. Secretary, and I am aware that you are insisting that every effort be made to recruit domestic workers before you call for the importation of workers under Public Law 414. Knowing this, I have questioned the agricultural producers and processors in Colorado with the greatest care concerning their recruitment efforts. In addition to correspondence, I have received a verbatim account from one who has spent many years in labor recruitment activity in Texas, Oklahoma, New Mexico, Arizona, and other Southwestern States. He has described for me the stepped-up recruitment that is taking place this year. In addition, Mr. Secretary, the Colorado State employment service has long been active in the recruitment field and has stepped up its activities this year.

It is interesting to note that the combined efforts of the producers, processors, and the State in the search for domestic workers could not fully meet the needs in any of the years from 1951 to the present, and this was during a time when there was not nearly the competition for the domestic workers that there is and will be this year.

April 7, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1707

the so-called voting tests and other requirements for voting in Virginia and Texas.

Both States voted less than 50 percent in the presidential election of November 1964.

Both States have a relatively high percentage of nonwhite population.

Both States in November 1964 required the payment of poll taxes as a prerequisite for voting in all but Federal elections.

The voting lists for the 1964 presidential election in Texas were composed of the names of persons certified by the poll tax collectors as having either paid their \$1.75 poll tax, or as having formally applied for and received a certificate of exemption from payment for voting in the Federal election.

Like Texas, Virginia voters were exempt from payment of their \$1.50 poll tax as a requirement for voting in the 1964 Federal election. The voting lists in Virginia were composed of the names of persons who had been registered under the Virginia voting registration laws.

In Texas, the so-called test is applied to prospective voters by the tax collector when they undertake to pay their poll tax; or when they formally apply for a certificate of exemption.

In Virginia the prospective voter is billed for his poll tax along with other taxes. He is asked simple questions of identification when he registers to vote at the office of a registrar.

In Texas the prospective voter must be able to understand the questions asked by the tax collector, and give the answers. In certain cases a husband can apply in behalf of his wife, and a wife can apply in behalf of her husband.

In Texas, article 5.14 of the election code requires the following questions to be answered:

Name?

Age?

Sex?

Race? (This is presumed to have been outlawed by a recent Federal court decision).

Occupation?

Length of residence in the State of Texas?

U.S. citizenship?

Native-born or naturalized citizen?

State or county of birth?

Length of residence in county.

Texas post office address (if residence is in an incorporated city or town give the ward, street, and number of residence in lieu of post office address, and length of residence in such city or town)?

Political party affiliation?

In Virginia, title 24, section 68, of the code requires the following questions to be answered in writing by the person registering, without assistance:

Name?

Age?

Date and place of birth?

Residence?

Occupation?

Have you ever voted before?

State, county and precinct where you last voted?

(Members of armed services are required to give their service, serial number and discharge date where pertinent.)

(Naturalized citizens are required to give date, court and State where they received their naturalization papers, along with their petition and certificate numbers.)

All persons registering are required to sign the following oath:

"I ——— do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I am entitled to register under the constitution and laws of this State, and that I am not disqualified from exercising the right of suffrage by the constitution of Virginia."

But the Federal Attorney General, while admitting that both States are ensnared in his voting numbers trap, reveals that he has written this bill for the administration so that—

He can exempt Texas by simply asserting that Texas has no literacy test. But he can incriminate Virginia by inferring that Virginia has some kind of a voting test that will not get his approval.

The fact is that in State and local elections on questions of bond issues, debt, and other matters of public finance, Texas voters must own taxable property.

There is no such requirement in Virginia.

For State and local elections Texas requires payment of poll taxes for 1 year; Virginia requires their payment for 3 years, but the 3-year requirement does not apply to new voters coming of age or moving into the State.

What does the Federal Attorney General do about poll taxes? He exempts Texas from application of his bill. But his bill provides that his Federal registrars sent to poll tax States will collect the taxes for 1 year—as in Texas—from persons they qualify to vote.

Beyond this, he has testified that neither he nor his Federal registrars will "recognize" the 3-year poll tax requirement—as in Virginia.

But while the Federal Attorney General refuses to recognize the requirement to pay poll taxes for 3 years as a requirement to vote, he provides in his bill that he and his Federal registrars can disenfranchise persons they have qualified to vote contrary to State laws if they do not vote "at least once during 3 consecutive years while listed."

The people of Virginia, and the Nation, are justified in the condemnation of legislation such as the Federal administration and its Attorney General propose in the so-called Voting Rights Act of 1965.

They would pin a rose on Texas, but incriminate Virginia.

And when they incriminate Virginia, they deny it the judicial process accorded a murdered.

They would convict Virginia of voting discrimination, but deny it a pardon until it has proved its innocence of something else for 10 years.

They admit there is already ample law under which allegations of discrimination can be tested in the judicial process, but they want this special law to bypass judicial process for the punishment of the States of their choice.

For purposes of this law, the Federal administration and its Attorney General condone an eighth-grade education voting test in New York, but they want the power to qualify a moron to vote in Alabama.

They decry discrimination devices, but they have proposed a law which in itself is a discrimination device.

The Federal Attorney General has no patience with the judicial process for the victims of this bill. He wants the power to deal with them himself.

The Federal administration and its Attorney General propose to incriminate certain States by means of dictator-type decree and a statistical formula.

They demand for themselves the right, under certain conditions which they name, to disenfranchise people they themselves qualified to vote.

The Federal administration and its Attorney General propose by a single Federal statute to take away the constitutional rights of States and substitute Federal Executive decree.

If this can be done for this administration, for the purposes of this bill, to punish the States it has chosen, it can be done at other times for other purposes to destroy the constitutional rights of others, the Constitution not withstanding.

It is significant that this bill would extend Federal control over all elections—Federal, State, local, and party primaries.

Federal agents are not to confine their control only to elections for political office.

They extend it to State and local elections with respect to public finance—bond issues, credit, expenditures, etc.

Simply by changing the statistical formula the Federal administration and its Attorney General can be empowered to extend their control over any and all States they wish to give this treatment.

What would remain of our form and system of government if all elections in all States and localities were controlled by the Central Government?

Only last month 99.9 percent of the people in Moscow voted in an election of candidates who had no opposition. And when Mr. Khrushchev voted, he was not required even to produce identification.

## UN Negotiate What?

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the demands for negotiations in Vietnam have increased in tempo and volume. Several nations have urged this course, as well.

Yet the United States remains reluctant to negotiate and not without reason. This is discussed with good logic in the following editorial from the Indianapolis Times of April 3, 1965:

## NEGOTIATE WHAT?

Seventeen nations have signed a petition urging "negotiations, as soon as possible," to end the fighting in Vietnam.

The purpose of the negotiations, according to the petitioners, would be to find a political solution to the war "in accordance with the legitimate aspirations of the Vietnamese people and the spirit of the Geneva agreements on Vietnam."

The main legitimate aspiration of the people of South Vietnam is to be let alone, to get the Communist Vietcong from North Vietnam off their backs, so they may stabilize their government and go about developing their country—free of strife, for a change.

The spirit of the Geneva agreements was that South Vietnam would be a free country. What had been French Indochina was carved up, creating the states of North Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia and South Vietnam. The United States and South Vietnam did not sign, because there were too many concessions to the Communists—but Red China, the Soviet Union and North Vietnam, among others, did sign.

The violator of that agreement is Communist North Vietnam, encouraged at the least, by Red China and the Soviet Union.

In this light, what is there to negotiate? The freedom of the people of South Vietnam?

This would repudiate the Geneva accord and every sense of moral decency.

That leaves only one other possible issue for negotiation—the complete withdrawal of all Vietcong guerrillas, infiltrators, killers, propagandists and bomb-throwers. With an adequate guarantee against their return.

North Vietnam does not offer this. Red China resists it.

The 17 small nations—none with a direct stake in the Vietnam war—submitted their petition to Secretary of State Rusk who properly received it "with great interest." They also sent it to Russia, Red China and North Vietnam, the only governments in a position to provide the only answer—by pulling the Vietcong out of South Vietnam.

A1708

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

April 7, 1965

This requires no negotiation—simply a decision to keep the promises they made in the Geneva agreement.

## A Black and White Paper

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, Dr. George R. Davis, minister, National City Christian Church, read a paper on Sunday, March 14, 1965, not as a part of the sermon, but as a statement before over 1,200 persons.

In the emotional atmosphere, sometimes bordering on hysteria as it relates to civil rights matters, all of us would do well to study the very thought-provoking and moving words of this respected clergyman. Dr. Davis' statement follows:

## A BLACK AND WHITE PAPER

A call went out on Friday and again on Saturday from certain religious, civic, and civil rights leaders that the services of the churches in Washington, D.C., and everywhere across the Nation be used on March 14 to express militant demands for increased civil rights pressures, and that the services also be used as memorials to an outstanding minister who died at the hands of violent men this past week, in Alabama.

What I am about to do will meet those requests only in part, and I will meet the requests in a way which goes beyond the expectation and intention of those who quite rightly asked that the events of tragedy during recent days and weeks not be ignored by the churches. Because I will be expressing views at some points I have not heard expressed by the clergy this past week, in addition to making clear, very clear, some convictions I have against social injustices, and in addition to using portions of our services as brief memorials and for special prayers. I am sure I will not please all who hear me, perhaps will please no one at all. And yet I cannot remain silent. Across the years of my ministry, as I look back now, there were times when I remained silent, when I should have spoken, and times I spoke when I should have remained silent. Today I am confident, I must not remain silent. Only time will reveal the wisdom of my decision. Silence could leave the impression I am totally in sympathy with all that has recently taken place in Washington, and across the Nation, thus using my silence to let people draw their own conclusions about my feelings, without becoming involved personally in the crisis. On the other hand my silence could be taken as a complete lack of feeling, or concern, an unawareness of tragedy.

Let nothing I say later on in this paper, be taken as an effort to tone down the brutal facts of the assault upon innocent people engaged in Alabama or anywhere else in peaceful demonstrations, or to tone down the sickening happenings in Selma, Ala., last Sunday. Surely all of us, at least any of us who dare to wear the name Christian must be disturbed to the center of our being as we think about the senseless killing of the minister, as we think about his family, and of the many killings of human beings, Negro and white, in the South, yes, but also in the North. Later in brief moments of silence we shall remember these dead. And if there

are those who would like to contribute to the memorial funds which have been established for the Reverend James Reeb family, and who wish to send those gifts through this church, that will be done. And such gifts would be fitting, even if they were not needed by the family, and I do not know of their needs, but they would be fitting nevertheless as symbols of concern. All of the above I wanted to say before I speak the one special word which has not been spoken by the "responsible clergy," this past week, or recently. At least I have not heard it, nor read it, from the clergy. Perhaps it has been spoken, but not reported by the press. This would not be surprising. The "responsible press, and radio, and television" seem to be willing at times to report only one view. I know this from having seen the word I speak, twisted, lifted out of context. So before I speak that word, which has not been spoken by the clergy, or the pickets, or the marchers, or the civil rights leaders, or at least I have not heard it spoken, I wanted to say the above.

And before I speak that word, I wish also to say the following: Can there be any among us, who wear the name Christian who do not feel shame for the long injustices practiced toward our fellow Americans, in the denial of voting privileges, the shameful patterns of segregation in most of the ways we have conducted our society? And let us now forget for a moment the so-called secular parts of our society, trains and buses, theaters, housing, jobs, schools, where men and women, youth, boys and girls, just because of the color of their skin, have been robbed of their dignity, their decency, their human rights, their American rights. Let us forget for a moment the pointing of the finger of scorn at the South. The North is guilty too. And this has been almost forgotten, if not totally forgotten, in the impressions left. The North is guilty too, perhaps even more so, with a kind of self-righteousness, a thin veneer of pretense. But let us forget all of the above for a moment, and think just about the churches across America, where we have allowed to be practiced what some have rightly called the most segregated hour of the week, the hour of morning worship on Sundays, in American churches. Let us pause to think just about the churches, forgetting, I say, for the moment, what we call the secular society. Let us think just of the churches, for the moment, where not considering the matter of church membership at all, men and women have not been made welcome even to enter, because of the color of their skin. [And I will not pose with self-righteousness myself, even though I have received into the membership of National City Christian Church all people who came forward, Negroes as well as whites, and during my ministry the church has been integrated. Indeed we have members from many national backgrounds, and of several races.]

Now that I have said all of the above I wish to say the one word, composed of many words, I have not heard spoken by the clergy. And it should be spoken. This is the word. I reject the mood which has been increasingly growing in this Nation, that is the movement of the solution of our problems to the streets. I reject the spectacle of laughing off, or condoning, or considering unimportant, or accepting as the normal pattern, by giving encouragement to such action, teenagers, children, and adults sprawled over the halls of the Justice Department, and the White House, especially the White House. I reject the spectacle of people throwing their bodies in front of vehicles, locking arms across busy streets and highways, marching in places and in numbers, inconsistent with a sense of real responsibility, all in the name of peaceful demonstrations. It is not the right to peaceful demonstrations, marches, picketing, against which I lift up my word.

Free men have these and other rights. It is the encouragement of the mood as the way by which ends are to be gained, and the mood has been growing and encouraged, about which I speak my word. I take issue with clergymen who this past week laid down ultimatums to the President of the United States, ultimatums to be met "or else." I take issue with clergymen who this past week said there "are times to ignore law and order" to gain desirable ends. I take issue with clergymen who with surprising arrogance this past week left the impression God speaks to them alone, and may not be speaking to sincere men who sit in the desperately dangerous seats of our national authority and leadership, and who accused their fellow-clergymen of being snowed by the President, after they returned from talking with the President and were impressed with his sincerity and intentions. I reject men who said this past week, "If some are killed in Alabama, the blood will be on the hands of the President of the United States," who said, "The President should lead the march on Selma," who inferred "The spirit of Christ has left the churches in the South, all of the white churches, and gone elsewhere." There are those who will say, "But all of this was in the past, spoken under pressure, let us forget all of this." But these remarks were made by responsible men in times of great emergency, and gave encouragement to irresponsibility on the part of youth, and others. I insist therefore the word of caution and moderation I am speaking is not out of place, or irrelevant to the situation. I reject the arrogance which presumed to suggest that the President of the United States needed to be reminded by men who hardly knew him, of his responsibility, when he had shown such concern in so many ways for the welfare of all of our citizens, from the moment he assumed the Presidency under such tragic circumstances, and who with others of many groups and both parties has been leading this Nation along to higher and higher goals toward making the rights of all secure. Indeed our present President must be given major credit for last year's strong civil rights law. I have been profoundly grateful this past week, there has been a man in the White House, trained, mature, disciplined, who would not be pushed into hurried action (that is action based on momentary judgments), or "black-jacked" into a course of action by any pressure groups, and yet a man who made it very clear at his conference with the press yesterday, where he stands.

He does not need my defense, perhaps might even consider certain parts of this paper mentioning him to be presumptuous. Be that as it may. Well he might insist on his right and obligation to conduct that high office in such a manner (in his way), as one thinks of his long and faithful service at every level of our national life, as one thinks of his stability evidenced hour after hour since that black November day in 1963, and as one thinks of the overwhelming "yes" this Nation said to him in November 1964. Of course, what the President said on Saturday (March 13) concerning human rights, civil rights, citizen rights, he has said so many times before. And only those who had paid no heed or who were wrapped up in their own egotisms could have failed to hear and understand him. This Nation did not deserve last week to be made a spectacle before the world by having our national leadership lifted up to ridicule and their motives carelessly questioned. I truly believe the South was moving forward, in many areas, that many people of good will were beginning to break through the walls of resistance. And I also know, and so do you, or you should know, that long before last week our Government was preparing new legislation to strengthen, to put teeth into vot-



April 7, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1709

ing rights, and other rights. [And it is in a sense tragic now to leave the impression before the world that the recent pressures brought all of this about, and that it would not have been brought about otherwise. In other words that we as a nation are taking at last to the streets, as the real means to gain the goals. Our Attorney General on the "Today" show, during the week of March 15, himself declared, in answer to questions, that the legislation was on its way, had been on its way for months. Last week did not enhance our position, our image, in many ways, including our display before our marching, picketing, neighbors all around the world, that we too are finally dedicated to this way of the streets as the way. And the impression also has been left around the world, and this was the purpose of some irresponsible people in their stepped up activity, that our leaders were not prepared to take action, except when compelled to do so, by high pressures, or when blackjacked into doing so, or when given ultimatums. It is this sort of movement in our Nation toward a policy, a frame of mind, about which I speak my word. One thing may be said about us as a nation, we did "come through it," as we will come through much else, on the long, long road we have to travel in the worldwide revolution now upon us. I lift only a word against the drift to demonstrations and ultimatums as the way to which we must be finally committed.]

As one who supports the National Council of Churches, and will continue to do so, my whole ministry has been and will continue to be dedicated to the ecumenical movement, the "ecumenical church." I reserve however the right to declare, I think the most recent calls for militant action were ill times and did not serve well the interests of Nation or church. I reserve the right to declare that not only the violent and evil men who killed James Reeb are guilty, but also some who stand in self-righteous innocence, who were a part of the aggravation, when ill-timed, must also share the guilt. Perhaps all of us are guilty in one way or another. I am willing to accept my part of the guilt. [I wish now to reject the wild accusations some have made against the Councils of Churches, local, national, worldwide, as being in the grasp of leaders who cannot be trusted, and that the churches should turn away from the councils. The work, ministry, and record of the councils, and of the leaders, have been too vital, too outstanding, to listen to such voices. But one may still reserve the right to honest opinion concerning specific actions and pronouncements. And one may still object to irresponsible statements, such as some made in Washington, and elsewhere, recently, and to which I have previously referred, and to ultimatums laid down even by "men of God."] I reserve the right in the present dialog to take issue with an irresponsible public official, let us say a segregationist Governor, or a bishop who indulges in an irresponsible statement or ultimatum, though his basic purpose is sound.

[Often men fall their opportunities. I said in August, 1963, in a sermon, "Our Way of Life Is Threatened," "Unless States and cities, and persons, move more rapidly to bring justice to our social order, to deal with the problems of discrimination, Federal power will be used. It is always second best to take from communities and States, the power of law enforcement, but the continued denial of human rights to minorities, will offer no other course than Federal intervention." Governor Wallace and the State authorities of Alabama had the opportunity, the week of March 15, to retain to the State such rights related to guaranteeing peaceful assembly and marches. Not doing so, the President had no other choice than the one taken. But I also insist the civil rights leaders, in the light of the President's strong and eloquent address to the

Congress, Monday, March 15, and in the light of other factors moving in the direction of real achievements, had a supreme and glorious opportunity to call off, at least for the time being, all marches, demonstrations, picketing, to give the Nation a time of ease, and calm. But because so many are committed to this way, the way of the streets, and no doubt for other reasons, the golden opportunity was passed by.

When the Federal Court through Judge Johnson spoke concerning marches and demonstrations, and in particular the march from Selma to Montgomery, law and order were upheld, and with guarantees from police power of the Federal Government. But I think we should also be reminded that before the judge issued his decision, there were "responsible men," even some clergy, who had already declared how they would act, whatever the decision of the court. It is all of this about which I lift up my word. In how many cities, and States, could we at one and the same time provide protection such as given for the Selma-Montgomery march? Back of that question is my real concern, the drift toward a way, a way men have used, and rightly so, at times, and in places, but always while they were still committed to some other way as the better answer. [We speak of the August 1963 march on Washington, as a peaceful march. It was indeed, and as I look back upon it now, though I spoke against it at the time, I would agree it may have contributed to the forward progress of civil rights. But let us take a second look. (1) That march had all of the power of military personnel in the military district of Washington, D.C., guaranteed to stand ready for any emergency. (2) That march had all of the police force of Washington, D.C., and hundreds from New York City in preparation. (3) That march had the urgent request of authorities of the District to all people to stay off the streets, unless they were in the march. In some ways for a day or more in Washington we lived in a police state to guarantee peace. Many stores did not open, and those open had little business. Before the march started, looking down the streets, one had the impression of a "ghost town." (4) That march had the guidance of many responsible leaders to control the "hot heads." In fact two clergy refused to go on the platform at the great mass meeting to give prayers, until one of the radical leaders "toned down" the written remarks he was to deliver. Twice they insisted that he tone them down, before the very moving, and religious program began, as reported by press, radio, and television. Even of that vast march it may now be sincerely asked, "Is this way, into the streets, and which is becoming increasingly the mood of our time, the way we wish to encourage?" The word I speak is merely to raise this question now, and I think it is a relevant question.]

[I think it should be pointed out that not only the Washington march, and the Selma-Montgomery march had to have a vast cover of police protection, and it had to be either State or Federal, but that any march of such size could not be held anywhere in the Nation without some such assurances. And the risks will be increasingly great. We have heard it declared that passage of the voting rights bill will not stop the demonstrations, indeed will increase them, perhaps their size as well as their tempo. And this we must count on no doubt. The voting rights bill should pass and as hurriedly as possible, within proper limits for intelligent debate, and perhaps allowing for minor and needed changes. And much, much else must be done. I only lift my word concerning the movement of the time toward the streets. There are those who tell me such a caution is irrelevant to the times, and is not in the "mainstream." There are those who will try to relate my caution to reaction. There was

a time in the sad and tragic days of the McCarthy hearings when men and women were held up to ridicule as fellow travelers, "pinkos," Communists, because they dared to speak against right wing extremists, and because they would not go off the deep end with the McCarthy school of thought and behavior. Is it possible today, when a man dares to speak a word of caution about "the streets" that he will be accused of being against social justice? I am now on the defensive no doubt, but I will allow my pulpit utterances and my practical record in the ministry, in the ecumenical, interracial, and interfaith areas, long before I came to Washington, as well as since I came to Washington, to speak for themselves. And I will allow time to speak down the years.]

I urge my country and our people to reject the mood of our time, and to move away from complete surrender to a philosophy of seeking our answers in the streets, in gangs, in marches, in untamed crowds, in threats, in ultimatums. It is not only in civil rights we must confront this, it is everywhere. Do we wish to be rid of a chancellor of a great university, we march, we picket, we shout. Do some wish to subscribe to Castro's tune, in defiance of law, we ignore the Nation's request, violate her best interests, and humanity's best interests, and take to the streets. And if we watch carefully the faces and action of the participants, they are not all saints. To some all of this is a big joke, we do it for kicks, and there are also the beatniks out for the lark, and there are the extremists of all varieties.

And of course there are the earnest and genuine folk, and the saints. If I say or write anything which would suggest lack of respect for men like Ralph Bunche, many of my fellow clergy, and many faithful people, this is not my intent or spirit. But I do feel compelled to lift my word at the point where I have lifted it, and now. To open one's mouth today is to be misunderstood, misquoted, quoted out of context, and sometimes to be relegated to the company of people whose ideas you do not follow at all, but who will take advantage of a word of caution as being agreement with injustice, and the deep sickness of our time. But the word I have spoken I have not heard elsewhere. I doubt very much if in such a revolutionary time my little word will be heard, let alone followed, but I had to speak my word. Free men have the right to petition, to peacefully picket, to demonstrate, to march. There are deep, long injustices, to be removed, and they will be removed, as history shows, by peaceful means or by violence. It could have been hoped we were really ready for law and order, for an increasing turning to the courts, to the ways of mature men, and especially when we are trying to lead a strife torn world, and many new nations to the ways of law and order, to the way of world courts. And this is especially so, when this Nation has done so much, and made so much progress, and really did not finally deserve to be presented before the world in such a sad light. It is true indeed free men have the right to a great deal. They also have the right and obligation to be responsible. [In the present dialogue I offer my views sincerely, but not dogmatically in the sense that I reject the right of other men to question my views. I do insist the word I have spoken needs to be spoken, and I insist on the right of good conscience to speak it. And I hope I do so in good will and Christian charity.] [When men look back upon this time, and were to ask me, "Where were you?" I will have to answer, "I did not march." But I like to believe I have for a good many years been deeply involved, with some results, in my own way. And only God, not I, nor they could be the judge of that.]

GEORGE DAVIS.

A1710

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

April 7, 1965

## Liberals Push Red Line for Peace in Vietnam

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I insert the following article from the Indianapolis Star of April 4, 1965:

## LIBERALS PUSH RED LINE FOR PEACE IN VIETNAM

(By Michael Padev)

WASHINGTON.—Liberals, Socialists and other supporters of what is known as the left are often offended when they are accused of being soft on communism.

They point out that they are, in fact, more effective in their opposition to communism precisely because their liberal policies of social reform deprive the Communists of the most popular points in their program. The argument is that when the voters discover that not only Communists are for the poor or for social justice, they won't join the Communists but will, instead, support the liberals, the democratic Socialists and the other leftwingers. Only the left can fight communism effectively, these liberals argue, because only the left can present to the people popular and appealing political programs.

I have never been impressed by these liberal arguments for the simple reason that I don't accept the notion that Communist political programs are popular. The Communists have never come to power by way of the ballot box anywhere on earth. Communist political programs have never had popular appeal except with a minority of voters. The Communists themselves admit that. For this reason Communists reject the idea of democratic government and of free democratic elections. Those liberals who believe that you can fight the Communist danger effectively by a program of social reform haven't studied communism seriously in either theory or practice.

## FOREIGN POLICY STAND TAKEN

It is in the international field, however, that liberals fall most of the time to see the true nature of the Communist danger. That's why liberal foreign policy programs can seldom combat international communism in any serious way. More often than not liberal positions on foreign policy problems actually help the Communists.

I used to think that the liberals did this out of sheer ignorance combined with political stupidity. But lately I have been asking myself, What is it that the liberals really want, say in Vietnam?

And I have come to the reluctant conclusion that in Vietnam most liberals want the same things which the Communists want. This does not mean that the liberals should be considered Communists or pro-Communist. But it does mean that, on the Vietnam issue, the Communists and some of the liberals find themselves on the same side of the political barricade.

Liberals, for example, or at least most of them, want the U.S. air strikes over Communist targets in North Vietnam stopped immediately. So do the Communists. Most liberals advocate a phased American withdrawal from South Vietnam. So do the Communists. Most liberals want some form of neutralization of South Vietnam. So do the Communists.

## CRY OF COLONIALISM RAISED

Most liberals are horrified to see the United States expand its political influence and military power in southeast Asia. So are the Communists. Most liberals argue that the Communist guerrillas in South Vietnam are not agents of the Communist regime of North Vietnam but are local patriots and revolutionaries who want to free their country from "colonialism." This, of course, is exactly what the Communists are saying.

Perhaps the most revealing document on liberal thinking on Vietnam was published the other day in an editorial in that New York daily newspaper which rightly claims to be the official organ of the liberal establishment in the United States. The editorial favors an American-sponsored "regional development plan" in South Vietnam to supply the necessary food for the hungry Communist states of North Vietnam and Red China. The editorial said "the Communist effort to seize the rice surplus areas of southeast Asia by war would appear less attractive once it became clear that vastly larger supplies could be obtained through peace."

I submit that such a solution of the Vietnam crisis would be welcomed by the Communists. Nothing suits better the Communist purpose than to obtain, in Winston Churchill's words, "the fruits of war without war."

## Senior Citizens' Health Programs

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to call to the attention of the membership my views on medicare as outlined in my monthly report to the residents of my congressional district last month.

## SENIOR CITIZENS' HEALTH PROGRAMS

(From Congressman ELMER J. HOLLAND, 20th District of Pennsylvania)

At long last it appears that Congress—both the House and the Senate—will act favorably on legislation to provide adequate hospitalization, nursing home care, home nursing care and diagnostic services for our elder citizens, 65 and over, the program will come under the Social Security Act, as I have long advocated.

President Johnson sent the following message to a recent luncheon meeting held in Washington and sponsored by the Senior Citizens Golden Ring Council of New York. In substance, he said:

"The crusade for health care is on the verge of victory.

"The long debate is drawing to a close. There is going to be a program of health insurance for older people in this country. And the basis of that program is going to be our great social security system.

"For far too long older Americans have had to cope as best they could with the steeply rising costs of hospital care and other health services that you need.

"You have been patient in your actions, progressive in your thinking. Now your patience is to be rewarded by action."

Congressman MILLS, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee—attended that luncheon, and told the guests the health care package would include the following:

1. A basic social insurance program of hospital care, based on the King-Anderson bill.

2. An increase in social security cash benefits.

3. An optional supplementary program covering many health expenses—not included in the basic hospital insurance program—to be partially financed from Federal funds.

4. Improvements in the existing Kerr-Mills Act (medical assistance for the aged)—to include provisions for medical care to needy children, as well as the needy elderly who cannot qualify under the social security program.

The bill—including the four programs—was reported out by the Ways and Means Committee on March 23. It is now in the Rules Committee awaiting a rule under which it will be considered by the House. (The Rules Committee determines whether a bill comes out under a closed rule—meaning no amendments can be offered from the floor—or an open rule—meaning that amendments can be offered by the Members for consideration.)

One thing is certain—however—the bill will reach the floor of the House for a vote. Early this session, Members of the House passed a resolution reinstating the 21-day rule—which authorizes the Speaker of the House to call up for House action any bill approved by a legislative committee that has not been cleared for House consideration by the Rules Committee within 21 days. In other words, the Rules Committee received the legislation on March 24, and if it takes no action, Speaker McCormack can have the measure placed before the House for consideration after April 14. Therefore, we will soon have the opportunity to vote for the legislation.

In 1956, when I ran for Congress in a special election, I campaigned on a platform stating my support of the Forand bill to provide hospitalization, medical care and drug costs for persons receiving social security and railroad retirement benefits. After my election, I introduced the Forand bill and became a cosponsor (84th Cong.).

I have reintroduced that bill each Congress—up to the present—(89th Cong.). This session I cosponsored the King-Anderson bill (H.R. 1813). The administration backed the King-Anderson program, and while it did not provide broad coverage, I have stated I would vote for it if a better program was not obtainable. However, I felt the provisions of the Forand-Holland bill were preferable. In an effort to appease the American Medical Association, the administration deleted the portion of the old Forand-Holland measure "to provide coverage of medical and drug costs" and kept the hospitalization and nursing care coverage.

The AMA was not to be appeased, however, and it opposed even the limited version. That organization, over the years, has prevented the legislation from coming before Congress.

The AMA first opposed, then endorsed—and finally supported—the Kerr-Mills Act (medical assistance for the aged). This is a welfare program under which all persons 65 and over, who are on relief, can receive needed medical and hospital care, plus dental and eye care, diagnostic services, home nursing services and drugs with all costs paid by the State and Federal Governments. Under that program persons, 65 and over, who are receiving Social Security and Railroad Retirement benefits are entitled to hospitalization and nursing home care only, provided the pensioner can prove that he and/or his children cannot afford to pay for such care. \* \* \* His income is below a certain